DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 186 560 UD 020 561

AUTHOR Streit, Fred; Spack, Eliot G.
TITLE Community School District #10 (N.Y.C.), Title I ESEA - B/E 5051-91620, Impact Aid - B/E 5051-98720. Final Evaluation Report, 1978-1979.
INSTITUTION Community School District 10, Bronx, N.Y.
PUB DATE Jul 79
NOTE 61p.; Not available in paper copy due to light print.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Administrator Attitudes; Compensatory Education; *Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Programs; Individualized Instruction; Junior High Schools; *Mathematics Instruction; Paraprofessional School Personnel; Private Schools; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Public Schools; *Reading Programs; *Remedial Programs; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; Impact Aid; *New York (Bronx)

ABSTRACT

The following Title I and Impact Aid programs carried out in Bronx, New York's Community School District 10 are evaluated in this report: (1) a reading program providing remedial instruction to students in grades K-9; (2) a non public school component providing remedial reading and mathematics instruction to eligible students in grades 1-8 at private schools located within the district; (3) an Optional Assignment Reading Program for students in grades 7-9. A major goal of all three programs was to significantly increase the achievement of students from educationally disadvantaged backgrounds. Program objectives were achieved in the K-9 reading program and the non public school component, though not in the Optional Assignment Reading Program. Data presented in this evaluation include: program objectives, classroom observation reports, interview data from teachers, educational assistants and parents of participating students, pre and post achievement test results, and the status of objective attainment for each component. (Author/GC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

APR 3 9 1980

ED186530

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT #10 (N.Y.C.)

TITLE I ESEA - B/E 5051-91620

IMPACT AID - B/E 5051-98720

1978-1979

READING PROGRAM GRADES K-9	B/E 5051-91622 5051-98722
NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL COMPONENT-READING	B/E 5051-91623
NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL COMPONENT-MATHEMATICS	B/E 5051-91624
OPTIONAL ASSIGNMENT-READING	B/E 5051-91625 5051-98723

JULY 1979

SUBMITTED TO: COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT 10 (N.Y.C.)

SUBMITTED BY: FRED STREIT, Ed.D.
ELIOT G. SPACK, Ed.D.
Coordinating Consultants

UD020561

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Edmonds
New York City Board of Ed.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EVALUATION CONSULTANTS ii

LISTING OF TABLES. iii

INTRODUCTION iv

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY vi

READING PROGRAM GRADES K-9 B/E 5051-91622 and 98722

Program Description 1

Objective 1 7

Objective 2 11

Process Evaluation 13

NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL COMPONENT B/E 5051-91623 and 91624

Program Description 39

Objective 40

OPTIONAL ASSIGNMENT - READING B/E 5051-91625 and 98723

Program Description 42

Objective 46

Process Evaluation 48

DISTRICT 10 ESEA TITLE I UMBRELLA
CONSULTANTS FOR THE EVALUATION STUDY 1978-1979

COORDINATING CONSULTANTS: Fred Streit, Ed.D. - Eliot G. Spack, Ed.D.

READING PROGRAM GRADES K-9
B/E 5051-91622
5051-98722

Sherle Boone, Ed.D.
David L. Cox, Ph.D.
Annette Geier, Ed.D.
Donald L. Halsted, Ed.D.
Brice Hargadon, M.A.
Jill Sweiger Lewis, Ed.D.
Mark Nicolich, Ph.D.
Karen Rupp, A.A.
Eliot G. Spack, Ed.D.
Fred Streit, Ed.D.
Carolyn Stumpf, Ed.D.
Barbara Sutch
Penny Weeden, A.A.

NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL COMPONENT
B/E 5051-91623
91624

Fred Streit, Ed.D.
Eliot G. Spack, Ed.D.

OPTIONAL ASSIGNMENT - READING
B/E 5051-91625
5051-98723

Donald L. Halsted, Ed.D.
Mark Nicolich, Ph.D.
Karen Rupp, A.A.
Eliot G. Spack, Ed.D.
Fred Streit, Ed.D.

LISTING OF TABLES

TABLE #	
1	Analysis of Pupil Pre/Post Scores-by School by Grade
2	Students Completing Pre/Post Administration of Metro '78
3	Observer Ratings of Materials, K-2, Spring 1979
4	A Comparison of Ratings of Materials, K-2; Teachers, Educational Assistants, Observers, Pre/Post
5	Educational Assistants' Perception of Self-Preparedness, K-2, Spring, 1979
6	A Comparison of Educational Assistants' Perceptions of Self-Preparedness, K-9, Pre/Post
7	Educational Assistants' Ratings of Materials, K-2, Spring, 1979.
8	Project Teacher Rating of Materials, K-2, Spring, 1979
9	Number of Parent Interviews by School, K-2
10	Parental Perceptions of Children's Attitudes, K-2
11	Observed Student Interest and Participation, Grades 3-6, Spring, 1979.
12	Observer Rating of Materials, Grades 3-6, Spring, 1979
13	A Comparison of Ratings of Materials, Grades 3-6, Teachers, Educational Assistants, Observers; Pre/Post
14	Educational Assistants' Perception of Self-Preparedness, Grades 3-6, Spring, 1979.
15	Educational Assistants' Ratings of Materials, Grades 3-6, Spring, 1979
16	Project Teachers Rating of Materials, Grades 3-6, Spring, 1979.
17	Observed Levels of Student Interest and Participation, Grades 7-9, Spring, 1979.
18	Observer Rating of Materials, Grades 7-9, Spring, 1979.
19	A Comparison of Ratings of Materials, Grades 7-9, Teachers, Educational Assistants, Observers; Pre/Post

Listings of Tables cont.

TABLE #	
20	Educational Assistants Perception of Self-Preparedness, Grades 7-9, April, 1979
21	Educational Assistants Ratings of Materials, Grades 7-9, Spring, 1979
22	Project Teachers Ratings of Materials, Grades 7-9, Spring, 1979
NPR-1	Non-Public Schools Mean Pre/Post Test Scores in Reading Comprehension by School and by Grade
NPM-1	Non-Public Schools Mean Pre/Post Test Scores in Mathematics by School and by Grade
OAP-1	Students Tested in Program
OAP-2	Pre/Post Test Mean Scores by Grade
OAP-3	Evaluator Ratings of Learning Climate
OAP-4	Evaluator Ratings of Student Involvement

INTRODUCTION

This final evaluation report covers ESEA Title I programs operated in Community School District 10 during the 1978-79 academic year. Two programs provided services at public schools in the District; a third provided services at non-public schools.

A major goal of all three programs was to significantly increase the reading achievement of students from educationally disadvantaged backgrounds. In only one program, a major goal was to significantly improve matn achievement.

This final evaluation report presents a summary of all data collected in the evaluation process. Data include: classroom observation reports, interview data from teachers, educational assistants and parents of participating students, and pre/post achievement test results. The status of objective attainment, with supporting documentation, is presented for the objective(s) of each program.

The objectives of the K-9 Reading Program and the Non-Public School Components were fully attained. The objective of significantly improving reading beyond expectation was not attained in the Optional Assignment Reading Program.

All of the programs operational in the Title I eligible public schools in District #10 were confronted with a relatively high student mobility problem. Across these schools, a significant number of students who were enrolled in a Title I program were not participating at the end of the school year. The most prevalent factor accounting for the loss in enrollment was the relocation of families to other neighborhoods. In general, the programs' staff were successful in filling vacancies in program enrollment.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

READING PROGRAM GRADES K-9 B/E 5051-91622 and 98722

This program provided remedial reading instruction to students in grades K through 9 at the Title I designated elementary and junior high schools in Community School District 10. Remedial instruction supplemented the regular reading instruction which the Title I participants received. As of June 1, 1979, program enrollment was 9,204 students.

Individualized program planning and instruction were featured with one-to-one and small group instructional modalities utilized in the remediation process. In grades K-6, the average adult-student ratio was maintained at 1-5. In the junior high school grades, average of 1-8 was featured.

The stated objective of the program was attained. Observational data collected by the evaluators in the remedial reading sessions report the program functioned in a well planned, systematic manner.

Among the recommendations offered by the evaluators are: (1) that the district attempt to provide additional educational assistants and more space to maximize the operation of the program; (2) the replacement of worn-out commercial materials; (3) that efforts be continued to identify alternative instructional approaches for students in grades 3 through 6 who are not demonstrating progress; (4) that training for the educational assistants incorporate motivational techniques, unlocking unfamiliar words, using a variety of materials and using phonics as a language experience; (5) that efforts be continued to clarify roles of staff in the program; (6) that attempts be made to secure instructional materials early in the program year; and (7) that pupil profile sheets be updated on a regular basis. The evaluators recommend that the program be recycled.

NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL COMPONENT B/E 5051-91623 and 91624

This program provided remedial reading and mathematics instruction to students in grades 1 to 8 at non-public schools in Community School District 10. Students functioning below grade level, and, who would have been attending Title I designated public schools based on home address, were selected to participate in the program.

The evaluation of this program assessed improvement in reading and mathematics achievement for students in three participating non-public schools. At these schools, Title I teachers assigned by the NYC Board of Education were assisted in the conduct of remedial sessions by educational assistants funded under the District 10 Title I Umbrella.

Overall, the objective of significantly improving reading achievement beyond expectation was attained, as four of the tested grade levels evidenced significant ($p \leq .05$) improvement.

It is recommended that the program be recycled and that educational assistants assigned to the non-public schools continue to attend district workshops for the improvement of participant skills.

OPTIONAL ASSIGNMENT READING B/E 5051-91625 and 98723

This program, operating at JHS 141 in Community School District 10, featured remedial reading instruction for 108 students in grades 7 through 9. The program serviced students who, based on home address, would have been attending Title I designated schools and would have been eligible for remedial reading services.

Students received daily remedial instruction which was supplemental to the regular programming in English and language arts. An average adult-student ratio of 1 to 4 featured in the remedial sessions allowed program staff to emphasize small group and individual instruction.

The objective of the program, to improve reading achievement of participating students beyond expectation, was not attained.

Recommendations offered by the evaluators are: (1) a provision of a flexible student schedule which allows for maximum student participation; (2) a review of the assigned staff complement; (3) an improvement in one room's ventilation system; (4) the regular updating of student profile sheets; and (5) regular monitoring of student progress and a confirmation that instructional activities are consistent with pupil skill needs.

The evaluators recommend that the program be recycled.

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

READING PROGRAM GRADES K-9

TITLE I ESEA

B/E 5051-91622
5051-98722
1978-1979

The Title I Reading Program in District 10 is designed to provide remedial reading instruction to educationally disadvantaged students in grades K through 9 at designated Title I public elementary and junior high schools in District 10. Elementary schools and annexes participating during the 1978-1979 academic year are: PS 7, 8, 9, 26, 26 Burnside Annex, 32, 33, 46, 56, 59, 79, 85, 86, 91, 94, 122, 205, and 261. Junior high schools participating are: JHS 45, 80, 118, 143, and IS 115 and 137. The remedial reading services which are provided under Title I supplement the regular Board of Education reading instruction received by the participating students.

The primary goal of the program is to improve reading achievement for the student population serviced. Small group and individual instruction are featured at all grade levels. At certain grade levels students received remedial reading instruction in a separate classroom designated for program use. In other cases, project teachers and/or educational assistants provide instruction in a corner of the regular classroom or at learning centers established in the classrooms.

The number of students being serviced at each grade level as of June 21, 1979 is reported below. Overall, there were 9,204 students receiving remedial reading instruction as of that date.

Grade Level	Number of Students
K	793
1	1,183
2	1,500
3	1,087
4	985
5	849
6	760
7	903
8	795
9	349

Seventy-six (76) and one half-time New York City-licensed teacher positions and 358 and two half-time educational assistant positions are funded under Title I, inclusive of impact aid. At the District level, the program is coordinated by New York City licensed teachers (3 funded positions). One coordinator supervises services for grades K through 2, another supervises grades 3-6, and a third supervises the junior high school grades. Each coordinator organizes periodic workshops at the District Office to provide for on-going staff development and the introduction of materials for project teachers and educational assistants. These are augmented by the coordinators' visitations to the schools. At the school level, project teachers provide on-going training and supervision for the assigned educational assistants.

In the early childhood grade levels (K-2) an average adult-student ratio of 1-5 was maintained. As the school year progressed, regular classroom teachers increased their contacts with the Title I project teachers and educational assistants. The instructional staff assigned to the program at these grade levels, as well as the regular classroom teachers, were pleased with the program's operation and perceived noticeable improvement in the reading levels of the participating students. Participating students received remedial instruction on a daily basis. Major program needs which existed at the time of the post visitations by the evaluators were: additional workshops for educational assistants, the addition of educational assistants to the program at schools where large waiting lists exist and the development of new strategies to involve more parents with the early childhood grades.

In the elementary grades (3 through 6), a diagnostic prescriptive reading approach for the teaching of reading skills was emphasized. Participating students met in small groups of five to six children for four to five periods (45 minutes each) weekly. Observation data collected by evaluators visiting the remedial sessions report that in many cases the small group of five to six was further subdivided into small groups of two to three students. In nearly 90 percent of the sessions observed, remediation occurred in a corner of the students' regular classroom. The remaining sessions were held in a program resource room or reading lab. Resource rooms have been established at several sites. A major program need in some schools is for larger areas for Title I instruction, new high interest/low vocabulary materials for 5th and 6th grade students of low ability, the easy accessibility of materials to pupils in schools where materials are kept in storage rooms.

At the junior high school level, the average adult-student ratio of one to eight was maintained throughout the year. Participating students received a minimum of 135 minutes to a maximum of 225 minutes of remedial reading each week. The length of sessions varied from 40 to 45 minutes, depending on the school's scheduling of class periods. Typically, a student was scheduled for four 45-minute sessions each week. Major program needs existing at the time of the Spring 1979 evaluator visitations were: the physical separation of Title I reading and PSEN students at one school and the assignment of students to groups according to skill level at another school.

The need to transport materials and work with several grade levels presents some problem for "itinerant" or floating educational assistants throughout the K-9 program. The mobility of population within neighborhoods

of the District #10 Community is a problem which cannot be readily addressed, by the District Office. Additionally, there is a clear need for some in-service for the classroom teachers to communicate the role and functions of the educational assistant.

SUMMARY

The program functioned effectively at all participating schools. The program objective was attained at all schools in the program for grades one and seven. The objective to improve reading achievement beyond expectation was achieved at all other grade levels and schools except as follows:

Grade K - Schools B, G and J

Grade 2 - Schools B, C and J

Grade 3 - School B

Grade 4 - Schools B, L, I, H and K

Grade 5 - Schools B, C, P, L, H and K

Grade 6 - Schools B, G, H and K

Grade 8 - Schools T and U

Grade 9 - School U

When all pupil scores in the district were aggregated across grade levels, the analysis produced a significant determinant of improvement.

Overall, the program was effective in significantly ($p. \leq .05$) improving reading achievement beyond expectation.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 1978-79 INTERIM EVALUATION REPORT	IMPLEMENTATIONS OF THE 1978-79 RECOMMENDATIONS
1. The evaluators recommend continued training for educational assistants in the following areas: -motivational techniques and strategies for creating a purpose for reading -reduction of teaching of words and sounds in isolation -use of dictated stories for skill development -methods of unlocking unfamiliar words for pupils -use of new materials -incorporation of phonics development in a language experience situation	1. Recommendation implemented. Workshops have been conducted at the district office and at individual schools in an effort to train educational assistants and project teachers in these areas.
2. The evaluators recommend greater use of available learning centers in the classroom.	2. Recommendation implemented. Project teachers and educational assistants have been encouraged in the utilization of learning centers in the classroom during independent work periods.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 1978-79 INTERIM EVALUATION REPORT	IMPLEMENTATIONS OF THE 1978-79 RECOMMENDATIONS
3. Evaluators recommend a stronger effort to communicate those elements in the Title I proposal which clarify the respective roles of the classroom teacher vis a vis of the Title I Educational Assistant.	3. Recommendation implemented. Joint sessions have been held involving project teachers, educational assistants and classroom teachers during preparation periods and lunchtime, where practicable. Additionally, project teachers are attempting to assist on individual bases in role clarification.
4. The evaluators recommend the availability of instructional materials earlier in the school year and replenishing and updating of materials as needed. It is recognized that the actual purchase orders are processed through the Central Board of Education. However, the District should continue to apply pressure to the Central Board for an early release of funds for this program.	4. Recommendation implemented. The District Office has continued to apply pressure to the Central Board for the earlier release of funds. Materials purchased in late Spring have already arrived in preparation for next year's program.
5. It is recommended that there be an improvement in the quality of the arrangement of educational assistant instructional areas in some classrooms.	5. Recommendation partially implemented. Although efforts have been made to develop instructional "corners" more extensively, more improvement is needed at some sites.
6. Evaluators recommend that there be greater individualization within small groups.	6. Recommendation partially implemented. While some educational assistants have attempted to individualize by grouping, others have demonstrated even more flexibility.
7. It is recommended that there be continued implementation of activities which stimulate recreational reading and language development.	7. Recommendation implemented. Independent and group activities which are intended to stimulate language development using a mulit-media approach is clearly encouraged. Extensive paperback libraries are to be found in most reading labs.
8. Implementation of follow-up studies on students who have been in the Title I program for a number of years.	8. Recommendation partially implemented. It has been possible to chart a student's progress and make a study where the project teacher felt it would benefit the student.

THE EVALUATORS COMMEND

1. Mutually planned and well organized remedial sessions between project teachers and educational assistants.

2. The low adult-student ratio maintained at all grades which promoted optimum opportunity for individual instruction.

3. Overall adequacy of classroom facilities and materials secured for program use.

4. Cooperative teamwork displayed by the project teacher-assistant teams.

5. The supervision, staff training and development, and guidance functions provided by the project coordinators at the District Office level.

6. The variety of commercially produced and teacher-made materials at all grade levels.

7. The cooperation of the District personnel in an attempt to implement the interim evaluator recommendations.

8. The District program staff for their ability to provide extensive on-site assistance to the local schools.

9. The project teachers' skills in training and supervising the educational assistants and assisting them in the planning of instructional activities and development of materials.

10. The flexibility of educational assistants and classroom teachers to adjust their teaching styles in order to implement the program.

11. The classroom teachers' and assistants' enthusiasm for the program, reflected in their ability to work cooperatively, systematically and harmoniously towards common instructional ends.

12. The efforts of many classroom teachers to reorganize classrooms and to organize activity centers.

13. The increased use of activities to stimulate language development.

14. The increased use of activities to foster literary appreciation, reading for enjoyment and reading in the content areas.

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The evaluators recommend:

1. That, in an effort to service a greater number of eligible pupils, the district seek out all available funds to provide sufficient additional assistants and instructional space for the operation of this program.

2. That efforts be continued to replace worn-out commercial materials which are currently being used in this program.

3. That, in an effort to meet the specific needs of some students who have not progressed, th.. activities be devoted to the development of alternative approaches in teaching reading to individuals within small groups at grades three through six.

4. That, in an effort to meet the assessed skill needs of personnel, as identified by classroom observers, that the training of educational assistants in such areas as motivational techniques, unlocking unfamiliar words for pupils, using a variety of materials and using phonics as a language experience be continued.

5. In light of detectable signs of misunderstandings, that specific efforts be made to communicate the respective roles of staff members (program personnel vs. classroom teachers) as they are outlined in the application.

6. That even though all purchases are channeled through the New York City Central Board of Education, that efforts be pursued whereby instructional materials are available earlier in the program year.

7. That staff members increase their utilization of pupil profile sheets to provide a current updating of pupil skill improvement and/or mastery for grades three through nine.

OBJECTIVE 1

TO SIGNIFICANTLY IMPROVE READING READINESS SKILLS BEYOND EXPECTATION IN KINDERGARTEN AND GRADE 1 PARTICIPANTS AS MEASURED BY PRE AND POST ADMINISTRATION OF THE PRE-PRIMER (K) AND PRIMER (GRADE 1) OF THE METRO '78 SURVEY COMPONENT IN READING.

Students in the Kindergarten and Grade 1 levels were tested during October, 1978 with the Metro '78 Survey Test in Language. The Pre-Primer was used at Kindergarten and the Primer level was administered at Grade 1. The identical tests were administered again in April, 1979.

Pre to Post results are available for 594 Kindergarten students and 937 Grade 1 pupils. In the opinion of the evaluators, those tested pre/post adequately represent the program population.

Kindergarten Results

Raw scores were converted to scaled scores to percentiles and percentiles were converted to Normal Curve Equivalents (N.C.E.) for the total scores on the Metro '78 Pre-Primer Survey Test. Pre and post mean NCEs are reported in Table 1. The paired data t-test was utilized to test for significant ($\alpha \leq .05$) improvement.

The objective was attained for 10 schools in the Kindergarten level of the program.

Those schools where the objective was not achieved are: Schools B, G, and J.

Grade 1 Results

Using student results from the pre/post administration of the Metro '78 Primer Survey Tests (raw) scores were converted to scaled scores to percentiles and percentiles were converted to Normal Curve Equivalents. Pre and post mean NCEs are reported in Table 1. The paired data t-test was utilized to determine if significant improvement had occurred.

The objective was attained at Grade 1 for all 15 schools in the program.

TABLE

ANALYSIS OF PUPIL PRE/POST SCORES - BY SCHOOL BY GRADE

SCHOOL	GRADE	PREMEAN	POSTMEAN	MEANGAIN	N	SIGNIF
B	K	7.6667	18.3333	10.6667	9	NS
B	1	19.4762	28.6667	9.1905	21	S
B	2	24.5556	18.5556	-6.0000	18	NS
B	3	23.5833	30.1667	6.5833	12	NS
B	4	25.1429	27.3571	2.2143	14	NS
B	5	28.4444	33.0000	4.5556	9	NS
B	6	23.9167	26.9167	3.0000	12	NS
C	K	27.0000	38.0476	11.0476	21	S
C	1	21.1111	48.1111	27.0000	18	S
C	2	25.8421	33.3684	7.5263	19	NS
C	3	23.5000	34.2778	10.7778	18	S
C	4	22.1765	29.0000	6.8235	17	S
C	5	21.0909	24.5000	3.4091	22	NS
C	6	23.6500	35.9000	12.2500	20	S
P	K	9.4557	38.2532	28.7975	79	S
P	1	21.9245	38.8208	16.8962	106	S
P	2	21.7789	33.0316	11.2526	95	S
P	3	20.6346	31.2308	10.5962	52	S
P	4	24.0000	32.1923	8.1923	52	S
P	5	22.8696	24.0870	1.2174	46	NS
P	6	25.1944	32.4167	7.2222	36	S
A	K	20.4677	26.5968	6.1290	62	S
A	1	18.1444	30.6889	12.5444	90	S
A	2	22.7402	31.6693	8.9291	127	S
A	3	23.8909	34.2545	10.3636	110	S
F	4	23.1951	28.6463	5.4512	82	S
F	5	22.3231	25.1077	2.7846	65	S
F	6	2.4167	29.3056	26.8889	72	S
D	K	18.5870	45.5652	26.9783	46	S
D	1	21.7500	50.3000	28.5500	60	S
D	2	22.6782	40.9080	18.2299	87	S
D	3	17.8750	24.0625	6.1875	64	S
D	4	21.5902	30.6230	9.0328	61	S
D	5	24.5833	28.6905	4.1071	84	S
S	6	25.3778	29.8000	4.4222	45	S
M	1	18.9231	39.6154	20.6923	78	S
M	2	22.9533	33.5327	10.5794	107	S
M	3	20.5316	29.9114	9.3797	79	S
M	4	22.9326	26.3596	3.4270	89	S
M	5	22.5128	28.0000	5.4872	39	S
M	6	22.4516	35.7419	13.2903	31	S
L	K	20.7143	37.0476	16.3333	21	S
L	1	16.6667	26.7143	10.0476	21	S
L	2	25.2917	36.6250	11.3333	24	S
L	3	27.1875	39.8125	12.6250	16	S
L	4	33.5333	33.0000	-0.5333	15	NS
L	5	32.6667	33.8889	1.2222	9	NS
L	6	22.1000	35.9000	13.8000	10	S
E	K	5.6429	25.3333	19.6905	42	S
E	1	20.6538	27.5962	6.9423	52	S
E	2	19.6164	32.6575	13.0411	73	S

ANALYSIS OF PUPIL PRE/POST SCORES - BY SCHOOL BY GRADE

SCHOOL	GRADE	PREMEAN	POSTMEAN	MEANGAIN	N	SIGNIF
E	3	22.5658	30.5658	8.0000	76	S
E	4	20.1591	28.0455	7.8864	44	S
E	5	28.0253	31.0000	2.9747	79	S
E	6	25.7255	33.9020	8.1765	51	S
O	K	19.9302	42.5814	22.6512	43	S
O	1	22.8265	38.7755	15.9490	98	S
O	2	17.1220	31.4024	14.2805	82	S
O	3	21.3151	28.1918	6.8767	73	S
O	4	24.3651	35.3492	10.9841	63	S
O	5	21.9492	25.9661	4.0169	59	S
O	6	27.9333	33.9167	5.9833	60	S
G	K	14.5200	16.9733	2.4533	75	NS
G	1	17.7903	32.9355	15.1452	62	S
G	2	12.0625	34.0104	21.9479	96	S
G	3	24.7442	32.7558	8.0116	86	S
G	4	27.8659	33.6829	5.8171	82	S
G	5	23.3553	28.5000	5.1447	76	S
G	6	26.7857	32.2857	5.5000	14	NS
Q	K	14.6250	35.2500	20.6250	32	S
Q	1	22.6933	31.8267	9.1333	75	S
Q	2	24.3143	28.6429	4.3286	70	S
Q	3	19.8246	26.2632	6.4386	57	S
Q	4	19.1429	26.2000	7.0571	35	S
I	K	9.8333	42.1515	32.3182	66	S
I	1	17.9467	40.1333	22.1867	75	S
I	2	23.3964	30.6331	7.2367	169	S
I	3	18.7344	22.1406	3.4063	64	S
I	4	19.3500	21.6100	2.2600	100	NS
I	5	23.3415	27.0366	3.6951	82	S
I	6	18.9545	24.8485	5.8939	66	S
J	K	19.9091	25.1818	5.2727	22	NS
J	1	10.0714	25.4286	15.3571	28	S
J	2	24.1818	25.2727	1.0909	33	NS
X	6	29.7105	37.0526	7.3421	38	S
H	1	19.6618	41.4706	21.8088	68	S
H	2	31.9670	43.2308	11.2637	91	S
H	3	28.0893	39.5179	11.4286	56	S
H	4	28.6250	29.7250	1.1000	40	NS
H	5	27.5172	30.3448	2.8276	29	NS
H	6	24.5417	28.6250	4.0833	24	NS
N	K	22.1184	36.0789	13.9605	76	S
N	1	23.3765	37.9647	14.5882	85	S
N	2	24.4298	32.9825	8.5526	114	S
N	3	21.4835	28.3297	6.8462	91	S
K	4	23.9508	20.5082	-3.4426	61	S(loss)
K	5	22.8333	24.3939	1.5606	66	NS
K	6	31.4138	32.4310	1.0172	58	NS

TABLE 1 (Continued)

ANALYSIS OF PUPIL PRE/POST SCORES - BY SCHOOL BY GRADE

SCHOOL	GRADE	PREMEAN	POSTMEAN	MEANGAIN	N	SIGNIF
S	7	23.11	37.11	14.00	111	S
S	8	23.25	34.43	11.18	95	S
S	9	23.03	28.60	5.57	98	S
T	7	27.75	36.63	8.88	71	S
T	8	35.73	29.79	-5.94	23	NS
X	7	24.31	31.08	6.77	127	S
X	8	29.05	34.22	5.17	140	S
V	7	26.13	34.58	8.45	42	S
V	8	27.73	34.14	6.41	108	S
V	9	22.45	31.11	8.66	33	S
Z	7	23.96	32.15	8.19	161	S
Z	8	22.64	33.33	10.69	133	S
U	7	24.21	29.94	5.73	63	S
U	8	15.25	21.84	6.59	11	NS
U	9	23.40	26.23	2.83	25	NS

Source of data: Results on Fall and Spring administration of Metro '78 Survey Tests.

Mean scores expressed as Normal Curve Equivalents.

OBJECTIVE 2

TO SIGNIFICANTLY IMPROVE READING COMPREHENSION SCORES BEYOND EXPECTATION OF PARTICIPANTS IN GRADES 2 THROUGH 9 AS MEASURED BY PRE AND POST ADMINISTRATION OF APPROPRIATE LEVELS OF THE METRO '78 SURVEY COMPONENT.

Participating students in grades 2 through 9 were pre-tested in October, 1978 with the appropriate level of the Metro '78 Survey Test, Form JS in Reading. Post-testing was conducted in April, 1979 using the identical instruments. As per the evaluation design, the levels administered by grade were as follows:

Grade	Test Level
2	Primary 1
3	Primary 2
4 & 5	Elementary
6	Intermediate
7, 8, & 9	Advanced 1

Test scores were collected for total reading in raw score form and were converted to scaled scores to percentiles to normal curve equivalents. Table 1 identifies the results of the participating schools by grade levels along with the number of students tested pre/post. Table 2 records the tally of total students completing the pre/post administration of the Metro '78. This volume enables the evaluators to offer the opinion that the tested population adequately represents the serviced population.

TABLE 2

STUDENTS COMPLETING PRE/POST ADMINISTRATION OF THE METRO '78

Grade Level	Number Tested
K	594
1	937
2	1205
3	854
4	755
5	655
6	537
7	575
8	510
9	156

By examining the listings on Table 1 it is clear that the objective of significantly improving reading scores beyond expectations ($p. \leq .05$) was attained at most schools and grade levels in total reading. Those grade levels/ schools where the objective was not attained are:

OBJECTIVE NOT ATTAINED ON TOTAL READING

Grade 2	Schools	B	C	J			
Grade 3	School	B					
Grade 4	Schools	B	L	I	H	K	
Grade 5	Schools	B	C	P	L	H	K
Grade 6	Schools	B	G	H	K		
Grade 8	Schools	T	U				
Grade 9	School	U					

In the opinion of the evaluators, the program achieved the objective stated based on results measured by the METRO '78 Survey Test.

PROCESS EVALUATION-OBJECTIVES 1 and 2

EARLY CHILDHOOD GRADES K - 2

The evaluators developed and utilized structured guides to conduct classroom observations and interviews with project teachers, educational assistants and city tax-levy classroom teachers. The first series of scheduled observations and interviews was conducted during the Fall, 1978. The post series was conducted during April and May, 1979. All schools participating in the Title I reading program at grades K-2 were visited. Interviews were also conducted during the Spring of 1979 with randomly selected parents of program participants. A total of 15 schools plus two annexes were visited for purposes of evaluating the K-2 program.

The Early Childhood Program is designed to facilitate and promote reading readiness and language development of children in grades K-2 who have not reached minimal competency levels. The Program uses a three-pronged design which includes Storytelling, Word Recognition and Language Experience. At the school level the program operates under the direction of one or two Project Teachers who provide on-going training and supervision of the educational assistants. The educational assistants assigned to the Early Childhood Program work with one or more classroom teachers, usually taking small groups of children to a corner of the classroom or a center where intensive remediation in reading readiness activities or developmental reading is provided. Each child in the program receives a minimum of 75 minutes per week of Title I instruction in kindergarten and 2½ hours in grades 1 and 2. This supplements regular Language Arts instruction provided by the classroom teacher. A diagnostic prescriptive approach is the basis for the Title I instruction, wherein the children's test scores and classroom performance are used as the basis for making instructional decisions. These decisions are continually undergoing review and revision.

Observations

A total of 52(Fall-Pre) and 48 (Spring-Post) classrooms in grades K-2 were visited. An effort was made to observe at least one class at each grade level at each site. Structured guides were developed and employed by the evaluators for these observations. The majority of the sessions were conducted in a regular classroom where a City tax-levy teacher instructed most of the children while the educational assistant held small group Title I sessions in a corner at the rear of the classroom or in one of the centers. Sessions are also conducted in the Early Childhood Program resource rooms at some schools, usually on a rotating basis. During post visitations, two observed sessions were conducted in a hallway in close proximity to the classroom from which the children had come. In all but one case, the working areas appeared adequate for the numbers of children being served and the type of activity the educational assistant had planned. In many cases, the educational assistants working with a group enabled the classroom teacher to also work with a small group while the balance of the class engaged in independent activities. The learning climate was thus rated high.

The educational assistants appeared very successful in small group management. They provided considerable direct instruction to the children and experienced very few discipline problems. The high level of the children's interest in the Title I activities as well as the educational assistants' warm rapport

with the children appeared to contribute to the success with which the educational assistants were able to conduct the lessons.

The activities in which children participated were many and varied. Most of them were conducted with the entire group with which the education l assistants was working, usually 4-5 Title I children. The lessons ranged from skill development in visual and auditory discrimination and memory to perceptual motor skill development and listening comprehension. Phonics activities were conducted as were lessons which taught verbal concepts. Considerable flannel board story telling and dramatization were also observed. The educational assistants appeared well trained in all of these areas.

Supporting the efforts of the educational assistants were a large array of instructional resources. The rooms were arranged in a manner to faciliatate implementation of the three strands of the program. The observers noted that many of the materials the educational assistant might wish to use are housed in the centers in the classroom or in the educational assistant's special corner (See Table 3). The educational assistant is also able to draw upon a mulititude of resources from the Early Childhood Program resource room or storage areas elsewhere in the building.

TABLE 3

OBSERVER RATINGS OF MATERIALS GRADES K-2 SPRING, 1979 N=48

Category Observed	N/A	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Availability of reading materials	2		2	6	20	18
Quality of reading materials	2		2	7	14	23
Accessibility of materials to children	2		6	3	6	31
Variety of materials (type, level)	2	1	4	7	12	23
Suitability to varied reading levels of children	2	1	2	6	23	15
Availability of manipulative games/ blocks, easel		2	1	3	20	22
Presence of learning centers	1	4	4	5	14	20
Presence of listening centers	2	8	3	5	8	22
Presence of library corner	4	1	1	6	8	28

See Table 4 for an aggregate comparison of pre/post observer ratings of materials.

TABLE 4

A COMPARISON OF RATING OF MATERIALS (GRADES K-2)
TEACHERS, EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANTS, OBSERVERS PRE/POST

Materials	Teachers N = 19/17						Educational Assistants N = 35/42						Observers N = 52/48					
	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excel-lent	N/A	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excel-lent	N/A	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excel-lent	N/A
Availability of reading materials	0/0	1/0	4/3	7/5	7/9	0/0	0/0	2/4	6/6	14/12	13/20	0/0	0/	12/	15/	16/	9/	
Quality of Reading materials	0/0	0/0	7/3	8/5	4/9	0/0	1/1	0/1	10/8	8/16	16/16	0/0	0/	7/	22/	14/	9/	
Availability of kits, games	0/1	1/1	2/0	4/5	4/10	7/0	2/1	3/5	6/7	10/9	14/20	0/0	0/2	5/1	10/3	19/20	18/22	0/0
Quality of kits/ games	0/0	1/1	5/2	7/6	5/8	1/0	2/0	1/3	7/5	12/14	12/20	0/0						
Presence of library corners	ND/0	ND/0	ND/0	ND/3	ND/14	ND/0	ND/0	ND/1	ND/3	ND/6	ND/32	ND/0	ND/1	ND/1	ND/6	ND/8	ND/28	ND/4
Presence of learning centers	ND/0	ND/2	ND/3	ND/7	ND/5	ND/0	ND/1	ND/1	ND/5	ND/7	ND/28	ND/0	ND/4	ND/4	ND/5	ND/14	ND/20	ND/1
Presence of listening centers	ND/1	ND/1	ND/1	ND/7	ND/7	ND/0	ND/0	ND/1	ND/7	ND/9	ND/25	ND/0	ND/1	ND/1	ND/6	ND/8	ND/28	ND/2

ND = No data

Interviews with Educational Assistants

In conducting the post-evaluation, a total of 42 educational assistants were interviewed. A structured questions guide was used.

While several of those interviewed had only been in the program a short time, a few months to 1 year, most reported 7-10 years prior experience as educational assistants. The average number of years of experience for the group interviewed was 5½ years.

The educational assistants receive training from the project teachers from 1-5 hours per week in a combination of formal workshops, joint meetings with classroom teachers and project teachers and informal, daily contacts. The instruction includes training in instructional strategies appropriate for the three strands of the Early Childhood Program, demonstration of new materials, problem sharing, review of student needs assessments, and reviews of the program application. In addition to the school-based training, the educational assistants interviewed have attended an average of one workshop at the District Office this year.

Nearly 20 percent of those interviewed speak Spanish. Twenty-seven of these interviewees currently reside in the local school district community and another 11 previously resided in District 10 for a minimum of six years. Thus, most have an intimate connection with the community.

On the basis of their training and their experience, the educational assistants feel very positive about their ability to work with the children. (See Table 5) Some indicated that they have been in the program so long that additional training was not required, but many expressed a desire for more assistance in the areas of making games, using language experience, handling children's psychological problems, and administering discipline.

TABLE 5

EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANTS' PERCEPTION OF SELF-PREPAREDNESS IN WORKING WITH CHILDREN, K-2 SPRING, 1979 N=42

Category Observed	Very Inade-quate	Inade-quate	Somewhat Adequate	Ade-quate	Very Ade-quate
giving small group instruction in reading			1	15	26
giving 1-to-1 remedial reading instruction			1	11	30
preparing materials			3	14	25
using varied materials for remedial reading instruction			2	9	31
administering discipline				15	27
assessing student progress			3	15	24
telling stories to children				4	38

* See Table 6 for an aggregate (K-9) comparision Pre vs. Post of Educational Assistant Perceptions.

TABLE 6

A COMPARISON OF EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANTS' PERCEPTIONS OF SELF-PREPAREDNESS IN WORKING WITH CHILDREN PRE/POST

K-9 N= 86/95	Very Inade-quate	Inade-quate	Somewhat Adequate	Ade-quate	Very Ade-quate
Giving small group instruction in reading	0/0	0/0	4/4	33/30	49/61
Giving one-to-one remedial reading instruction	0/0	0/0	0/2	25/31	61/62
Preparing materials	0/0	1/1	8/8	37/36	40/50
Using varied materials for remedial reading instruction	0/0	1/0	5/9	39/31	41/55
Maintaining discipline	0/0	3/1	10/8	31/36	42/50
Assessing student progress	0/0	0/0	4/8	51/44	31/43

The educational assistants indicated a distinct feeling of comfort in their work situations. Their relationships with the classroom teachers were described as being "cooperative" or "Very Cooperative" by all of those interviewed. Many of them indicated that their day is systematically planned with the major considerations being the classroom teachers' plans and the children's needs. The educational assistants attempt to reinforce the classroom teachers' instruction as well as to complete gaps in the children's education which the teacher may not cover with the entire class. Nearly every educational assistant indicated that s/he had a time reserved for storytelling each day, usually before or after lunch. There was extensive use of flannel boards and dramatization during these activities and the educational assistants their concern with developing comprehension and listening skills during the storytelling periods.

The enthusiasm of the educational assistants towards the program extends to their attitudes towards most of the instructional materials to which they have access. (See Table 7) While satisfaction with current materials was noted, a few recommend that more workbooks, library books, and audio-visual materials be purchased.

TABLE 7

EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANTS RATING OF MATERIALS
GRADES K-2 SPRING, 1979

Program Adequacy	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
the availability of reading materials		4	6	12	20
the quality of readers/trade books/reading materials	1	1	8	16	16
the availability of a listening center		1	7	9	25
availability of kits (e.g. SRA)/ games/blocks	1	5	7	9	20
the quality of kits (e.g. SRA)/ games/blocks		3	5	14	20
availability of library corner		1	3	6	32
availability of learning center	1	1	5	7	28

*See Table 4 for a comparison of rating of materials K-2 Pre vs. Post

When asked to describe the strengths of the program, nearly every educational assistant expressed the view that being able to work with children in small groups and individually was the major strength. Several also mentioned that the project teacher-classroom teacher-educational assistant team and the

available materials contributed to total program effectiveness. While many were unable to identify any program weakness, 24 percent suggested a need for more paras and 52 percent rated parental involvement as only "fair" or "poor".

Interviews with City Tax-Levy Classroom Teachers.

Seventeen classroom teachers were interviewed during the post evaluation period in order to elicit their attitudes towards and perceptions of the Early Childhood Program and its effectiveness in remediating skill deficiencies. All 17 were very positive about their experiences with the program. They reported consulting with the project teacher on a regular basis ranging from as many as five times per week to only two times per month. They also indicated that they regularly confer with the educational assistants who work with their children, often during a common planning period or throughout the day in the classroom.

Many indicated that the program's greatest effect seems to be in promoting an interest in reading. The children enjoy working with the educational assistants and receiving the extra attention that the small groups provide. Thus, a pleasant experience becomes associated with their learning to read. This increased interest in reading in many cases has become a more generalized increased interest in school. A total of 265, or an average of 16 children per teacher are being served for each of these teachers interviewed. Of these, 226 were identified as both interested in the program and improving their skills. Of the remaining 39, 19 were interested but not yet improving, and four were not interested and not improving. Many of those not improving were identified by the classroom teacher as having "special problems."

Like the educational assistants, the teachers felt that the small group and individualized instruction provided by the Early Childhood Program was its most commendable feature. Thirty-five percent of the interviewees expressed a need for additional educational assistants so that more children could be serviced, and 29 percent requested that the classroom teachers be given more opportunity for input into the proposal and program implementation.

Interviews with Project Teachers

The seventeen project teachers interviewed during the post evaluation period have an average of 4½ years experience as Title I teachers and 11 years as classroom teachers.

Most of the support for the project teachers' work comes from the District Office. Most project teachers interviewed have attended workshops at the District Office on an average of two times per each month. Topics at these workshops have included child-centered education, the teaching of poetry, using children's language for reading development, teaching work recognition skills, and creating an Early Childhood Environment.

Additionally, the project coordinator or her assistant has made several visits to each school during the course of the year. During these visits the district coordinator visits classrooms to observe the educational assistants, to help with room arrangements, and to talk with all members of the staff involved with the program. These visits were rated as "extremely helpful"

by 53 percent and as "moderately helpful" by 41 percent of those interviewed.

The Project Teachers' responsibilities include the conduct of formal workshops and the provision for training of the educational assistants. Most Project Teachers hold one regularly scheduled workshop per week for about 45 minutes. Additionally training is provided through the daily contact the project teacher makes with each educational assistant during preparation periods, lunch, and when the project teacher observes in the classrooms. The training session includes a discussion of techniques, needs, materials, program goals, how to best create an early childhood environment, and a free sharing of problems. A few project teachers seem concerned about the lack of time to provide training and suggested that additional training time be incorporated into the program.

In addition to providing the training for educational assistants, the project teachers' program responsibilities include joint planning with classroom teachers, working on room arrangements, ordering materials, conducting the testing program, providing workshops for parents, and acting as a general resource person in the school. Some also work with children on a regularly scheduled basis.

The teachers considered the resources available for the program to be adequate. The Early Childhood Program instruction takes place in the regular classroom in most instances. All but four of these instructional areas were rated as sufficient in size to accomodate the students and, where they are not sufficient, the school is experiencing some general overcrowding conditions. Storage areas were less favorably viewed, with 53 percent indicating the need for more of this type of space. Nine of the schools were viewed by the project teachers as being overcrowded. This overcrowding has meant that not all target children can be serviced by the program. Eleven schools had waiting lists, with numbers ranging from 15 to 130 children.

Personnel resources are a strength of the Early Childhood Program. At all but two schools, the administration of the school was rated as having a "very supportive and positive" attitude towards the program; at two this was considered as "somewhat supportive." The educational assistant-teacher teams have generally been friendly and lessons have been organized and mutually planned. The project teachers expressed a great deal of confidence in the educational assistants' ability to work with children. Only six project teachers were able to suggest areas where additional training for the educational assistants would be desirable and these suggestions varied from school to school. Participation by parents in the program was rated less high, with 1 school rating it as 'excellent', 4 rating it as 'very good', 4 rating it as 'good', 5 rating it as 'fair' and 3 rating it as 'poor'.

The project teachers were very enthusiastic about the materials available for the program. (See Table 8) Many of them remarked that whatever they wanted, the District Office was able to obtain for them.

TABLE 8

PROJECT TEACHER RATING OF MATERIALS
GRADES K-2 SPRING, 1979

Program Adequacy and Needs	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Availability of reading materials			3	5	9
The quality of readers/trade books/ reading materials			3	5	9
The availability of equipped listening centers	1	1	1	7	7
Availability of kits (e.g. SRA)/ games	1	1		5	10
The quality of kits (e.g. SRA)/ games	1	1	2	6	8
Availability of library corners				3	14
Availability of learning centers		2	3	7	5

*See Table 4 for a comparison of ratings of materials for K-2 pre vs. post.

The project teachers felt that a number of factors contributed to the success of the program. Those noted most often were educational assistant competencies and team cooperation, the materials available, and the small group and individualized attention each child received. Forty-seven percent suggested that additional educational assistants would make the program even more effective and 41 percent indicated that greater classroom teacher input and/or training would also add to total program effectiveness.

Interviews with Parents - Grades K-2

During the months of March, April and May the evaluators interviewed 24 parents (all mothers) of children enrolled in the Title I reading program. A minimum of two interviews were conducted at each of eight schools designated by the District Office. (Table 9)

TABLE 9

NUMBER OF PARENT-INTERVIEWS BY SCHOOL N=24
BASED ON GRADE LEVEL OF CHILDREN (K-2)

School	Total Interviewees	Number of interviews by grade K	1	2
A	4	1	1	2
L	2	-	-	2
J	4	2	1	1
N	3	1	1	1
M	2	N/A	1	1
Q	3	-	2	1
G	1	1	-	-
P	5	2	1	2
TOTAL	24	7	7	10

N/A NOT APPLICABLE. No target children at this level.
-: No parents available for interview on the grade level indicated.

Parents of children in grades 1 and 2 were asked to rate their assessment of their child's level of enjoyment about coming to school during the current school year as compared to the previous school year. Fifty-three percent (53%) reported 'very much', 12 percent reported 'pretty much', 12 percent reported 'somewhat', 18 percent reported 'a little', and 6 percent 'don't know'. Fifty-nine percent (59%) reported that their child seems more interested in school this year than last. Thirty-six percent (36%) reported that 'somewhat' or 'pretty much' more interest was evidenced.

While sixty-three percent (63%) had met with their child's teacher or educational assistant at least one time during the 1978-79 school year, 29 percent indicated no knowledge of the Title I Reading Program.

The evaluators asked parents to identify aspects of the schooling experience which the child spoke about most at home. Responses, in order of frequency, included "stories read", "the teacher" (educational assistant), "fun", "new words", "games" and "shapes and numbers". Seventeen percent (17%) of parents interviewed revealed that their child does not discuss the reading program at all.

The child's perception of the classroom as a friendly, happy place and the degree of change in the children's attitudes toward enjoyment and interest in school were also elicited from parents. Three questions addressed these perceptions. (Table 10)

TABLE 10

PARENTAL PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR CHILDREN'S ATTITUDES
K-2 N=24

Question Posed	Number Responding	Number of Responses: Not at All	A Little	Some-what	Pretty Much	Very Much	Don't Krow
Does your child feel that his/her classroom is a happy, friendly place?	24	0	1	0	6	17	0
Grades 1 and 2 only							
Does your child enjoy coming to school more this year than last year?	17	0	3	2	2	9	1
Does your child seem more interested in school work this year than last year?	17	0	0	3	3	10	1

The parents were highly effusive in their praise for the academic and social progress that has been evidenced by their children. This group of parents viewed the schooling process this year as greatly assisting their children's achievement.

ELEMENTARY GRADES 3-6

The evaluators developed and utilized structured guides to conduct classroom observations and interviews with project teachers, educational assistants, city tax-levy classroom teachers and parents of participating students. Visitations to the Title I designated schools providing remedial reading serviced at grades 3 through 6 were conducted in the Fall of 1978 and during April/May/June 1979. Parent interviews were conducted during the Spring visitation period only.

At the middle grades (3 through 6) level, a diagnostic-prescriptive approach to the teaching of reading is emphasized. In grades 3 through 6, educational assistants work primarily with small groups of children grouped according to their reading levels. Each group is instructed for approximately 45 minutes per day supplemental to the reading instruction provided by the regular classroom teacher. Within these small groups (5-6 children), an effort is made to individualize.

In this program, the project teacher's tasks parallel those listed earlier in the Early Childhood component.

Observations

A total of 56 classrooms in grades 3 through 6 were visited during the Spring, 1979. An effort was made to observe at least one class at each grade level at each school. The majority of the sessions involved small groups of target children instructed by an educational assistant in a corner of the regular classroom while the city tax-levy teacher taught the rest of the class. In a few instances target children worked with the educational assistant in a separate room (resource room or reading lab). During the post visitations only two classes were observed wherein the educational assistant was working on a one-to-one basis with a single child either at that child's desk or in a learning center. In all but a few cases the remedial reading corner appeared adequate for the number of children being served and the type of activity planned.

During the small group instructional sessions, children were actively involved with a variety of materials, and the educational assistant usually provided two or more directed activities. These activities included instruction which reinforced word attack skills, especially phonics and structural analysis; comprehension development through silent and oral reading; and vocabulary building. There was evidence of activities designed to facilitate language development and interest in recreational reading. The learning climate and the level of student interest and participation in the observed sessions were rated high. (Table 11)

TABLE 11

OBSERVED STUDENT INTEREST AND PARTICIPATION
GRADES 3-6 SPRING 1979 N=56

Category Observed	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excel-lent
apparent level of student interest	1	3	15	18	19
apparent level of student partici-pation	1	1	14	16	24
behavior of 51% + (majority) of the students	1	-	3	16	36
adult-student rapport	1	5	11	16	23

At most of the observed sessions, the educational assistant provided the same materials to each child within the small group. Assistance was provided to individuals by working on a one-to-one basis for a short time and by handling particular difficulties as they arose. In practically all sessions observed, the educational assistant made the determination as to what the child would read and, even if the material seemed too difficult, it was rarely changed.

A large array of resource materials were available to the educational assistants in most of the classrooms. However, in one school (School A), as materials are borrowed by the educational assistants from a storage room,

as needed, there appears to be a paucity of observable materials in the classrooms. Additionally, in instances where the educational assistants are itinerant it is difficult to assess the quantity of materials available for a given classrooms. (Table 12)

TABLE 12

OBSERVER RATINGS OF MATERIALS
GRADES (3-6) N=56 SPRING, 1979

Category Observed	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excel-lent	In Resource Room or Lab
Availability of reading materials	4	3	7	22	14	6
Quality of reading materials	4	2	6	30	8	6
Accessibility of materials to children	4	1	11	16	18	6
Availability of low vocabulary high interest reading materials	4	5	17	17	7	6
Variety of materials	5	4	10	20	11	6
Suitability to varied reading levels	4	5	16	17	8	6
Availability of kits	2	4	12	24	8	6
Quality of kits	3	2	12	23	10	6

*See Table 13 for a comparison of Ratings of Materials (Grades 3-6) pre vs. post.

Although class profile sheets were available and included a variety of symbols designating skill improvement or mastery, no provision was made for indicating the date of improvement and/or mastery on an on-going basis.

Interviews with Educational Assistants

In the Spring of 1979, 40 educational assistants were interviewed to assess their perception of the program, (as compared to 38 in the Fall). Data collected during this post period indicated that these assistants have an average of 5.5 years of experience, most of which is as a Title I educational assistant. Fifty percent of the assistants report being bilingual, speaking Spanish, Italian, Greek, Vietnamese, French, Slovack or Yiddish as a second (or third) language.

Throughout the school year the in-service training for the educational assistants ranged from one hour per month to five hours per week depending upon such factors as years of experience, with one hour per week being most typical. All but 12 percent of the educational assistants interviewed had been to the District Office at least one time since September, 1978 to attend training workshops.

TABLE 13

A COMPARISON OF RATING OF MATERIALS (GRADES 3 - 6)
TEACHERS, EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANTS, OBSERVERS PRE/POST

Materials	Teachers N = 19/20					Educational Assistants N = 38/40					Observers N = 55/56					
	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excel-lent	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excel-lent	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excel-lent	In Resource Room
Availability of Reading Materials	0/0	0/0	0/2	6/3	13/15	0/2	0/3	9/9	11/15	18/11	0/4	12/3	11/7	23/22	9/14	ND/6
Quality of Readers	0/0	0/0	2/1	10/7	7/12	0/1	0/2	6/7	20/19	12/11	0/4	3/2	16/6	26/30	10/8	ND/6
Availability of Low Vocabulary-High Interest Materials	0/1	3/0	3/3	7/8	6/8	0/2	5/7	9/13	19/11	5/7	ND/4	ND/3	ND/17	ND/17	ND/7	ND/6
Availability of Kits (Variety of Materials)	0/0	2/0	2/3	7/3	8/14	0/0	2/6	7/12	11/10	18/12	2/2	11/4	6/12	22/24	14/8	ND/6
Quality of Kits	0/0	0/0	4/2	8/10	7/8	0/0	0/3	10/10	14/15	14/12	ND/3	ND/2	/12	ND/23	ND/10	ND/6
Accessibility of Materials to Children	ND/0	ND/0	ND/0	/5	/15	/0	/6	/8	/7	/19	/4	/1	/11	/16	/18	ND/6
Variety of Materials	/0	/0	/4	/4	/12	/2	/7	/9	/6	/16	/5	/4	/10	/20	/11	ND/6
Suitability to Varied Reading Levels	/0	/1	/2	/9	/8	/0	/4	/10	/12	/14	/4	/5	/16	/17	/8	ND/6

In the post-program interviews, the assistants expressed a high degree of confidence in their ability to handle instructional responsibilities. (See Table 14)

TABLE 14

EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANTS' PERCEPTION OF SELF-PREPAREDNESS IN WORKING WITH CHILDREN GRADES (3-6) N=40 SPRING, 1979

Category Observed	Very Inade-quate	Inade-quate	Somewhat Adequate	Ade-quate	Very Ade-quate
giving small group instruction in reading	-	-	3	11	26
giving 1-to-1 remedial reading instruction	-	-	1	18	21
preparing materials	-	1	5	17	17
using varied materials for remedial reading instruction	-	-	6	15	19
administering discipline	-	1	6	12	21
assessing student progress	-	-	4	24	12

*See Table 6 for an aggregate (K-9) comparison pre vs. post of Educational Assistants' Perceptions.

When asked in what areas they would like additional training, some of the educational assistants reported that they could use more in-service training in maintaining discipline, teaching reading comprehension, and working with learning disabled children. However, many indicated that they felt adequately prepared and that the project teacher would train them in anything they did not know.

Educational Assistants indicated a positive relationship with the classroom teachers and volunteered that the educational assistant-teacher teams met regularly and are extensively involved in the diagnostic and prescriptive aspects of the planning. The educational assistants considered the teachers to be extremely supportive of the program and of their work.

The educational assistants identified several aspects of the program which they felt contributed to its success. Specifically mentioned was the ability to work on an individual basis and with small groups of children and cooperatively plan with the classroom teachers. Many were unable to name any weaknessess of the program, but several felt that more parental involvement and more educational assistants would make the program even more effective. Most of the educational assistants were highly pleased with the quality and quantity of the materials available in the program (See Table 15) and did indicate that worn-out commercial materials were being replaced regularly.

TABLE 15

EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANTS' RATINGS OF MATERIALS
GRADES (3-6) SPRING 1979 N=40

Category Observed	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
The availability of reading materials	2	3	9	15	11
Quality of reading materials	1	2	7	19	11
Accessibility of materials to children	0	6	8	7	19
Availability of low vocabulary high interest reading materials	2	7	13	11	7
Variety of materials	2	7	9	6	16
Suitability to varied reading levels	0	4	10	12	14
Availability of kits	0	6	12	10	12
Quality of kits	0	3	10	15	12

*See Table 13 for a comparison of ratings of materials, Grades 3-6, pre vs. post.

When the educational assistants were asked for recommendations as to features that would make the program even more successful, several expressed their concern for the number of children on the waiting list which could be reduced by the hiring of more educational assistants. Several also felt that more materials, particularly consumable workbooks, more meetings for them at the District Office and the continued replacement of worn-out commercial materials would enhance the remedial reading program. Some educational assistants requested that materials be specifically reserved for the middle grades so that children who had been in the program for several years would have some new items with which to work in Grades 5 and 6. Apparently there are some expressions of monotony derived from excessive repetition.

City-Tax Levy Classroom Teacher Interviews - Grades 3-6

Interviews were conducted with 18 classroom teachers in the Spring, 1979. Interview data indicate that these teachers hold positive opinions of the remedial reading program and of the reading improvement which the program promotes. Classroom teachers report consulting with the project teacher at least once a month and with the Title I educational assistants on the average of three times a week. In their consultations with the educational assistants, the classroom teachers most frequently discuss individual pupil reading progress, skill acquisition and follow-up classroom activities.

The interviewed classroom teachers were asked to categorize children in their classes receiving remedial instruction into various achievement and interest categories. Spring, 1979 data identified 80 percent of the target children as being "interested and improving" in reading skills.

The most commendable features of the program, as cited by the City Tax-Levy teachers were small groups, individualization of instruction, and the high caliber of the educational assistants. The loss of instruction caused by pulling pupils away from primary learning areas, the lack of flexibility of scheduling for the small groups of target children, and the disruptive nature of the small group working with the regular classroom were identified as program weaknesses by several classroom teachers.

Most of the interviewed city tax-levy teachers felt that the program creates an interest in reading, is at least moderately effective in remediating skill deficiencies, had had a positive impact on the entire school and instills self-confidence in target children. They would like to see more educational assistants hired so that more target children could be serviced.

Interviews with Project Teachers

During the Spring, 1979, 20 Project Teachers were interviewed. They identified their responsibilities to include ordering materials, working with small groups of selected children, helping teachers to reorganize their rooms, insuring that the guidelines of the program are implemented and training the educational assistants. They reported the conducting of an average of 1½ hours per week of formal training at which time the educational assistants are presented with new materials/approaches and are helped with creating materials and planning lessons. Additional training is provided through demonstration teaching and small group or individualized training sessions. There appears to be a pattern of regular on-going communication between the educational assistants and the project teachers.

In addition, the project teachers spend their time preparing parent workshops, acting as a liaison between the classroom teachers and educational assistants, organizing the target population into instructional groups, screening new entrants, selecting and organizing new materials and reviewing the educational assistants' lesson plans.

When asked to report their perceptions of the relationships between the educational assistants and the classroom teachers, the project teachers indicated that the teams seem to be friendly and organized. It was reported that some lessons are more mutually planned than others. The project teachers indicated that they play a significant role in working with the educational assistants in planning the instructional activities and there is an attempt to base instructional decisions on the multiple inputs from the classroom teachers, educational assistants and project teachers. Diagnostic information, results of previous instructional activities and the materials available are all reported to be used to make these decisions. The project teachers feel that the educational assistants are clearly appreciated by the classroom teachers.

According to the project teachers, the educational assistants perform their duties most capably in the areas of familiarity with materials, teaching phonics, sensitivity to children and the ability to establish rapport with students. They receive additional training through workshops conducted at the District Office and visitations to the schools from the district program coordinator. Several workshops have been held at the District Office during this school year. Topics included testing, instructional procedures, storytelling, puppeting, comprehension, and a review of program guidelines.

Project teachers cited several areas where some educational assistants were inadequately prepared: teaching reading for meaning, discipline and management techniques, comprehension skill teaching and assisting children to read for inferences.

The district program coordinators had visited many of the schools and have helped with room assignments and orienting new educational assistants. These visits and workshops were judged to be very positive by the project teachers.

The project teachers identified a number of strengths in the program. These include the ability of the educational assistants, the small group and individualized instruction provided, administrative support, the diagnostic/prescriptive approach, the calibre of personnel, and the child-centeredness and concern for language development reflected in the program. Major weaknesses noted were the large number of students not being served and a shortage of educational assistants.

Project teacher recommendations for improving the program included hiring more educational assistants, offering in-service training in the understanding and recognition of learning disabilities, obtaining more parental cooperation and involvement, common preparation periods for educational assistants and more skill workshops. Many expressed concern over the high mobility of the student population which might reduce any long-term effects on the children's reading skill development.

Project teachers had attended several meetings at the District Office. Topics discussed included the new testing instrument being used by District #10 (the Metro '78); learning disabilities; parent workshops; theme-centered learning; Middle Grades Week; puppetry; creative writing. In addition, the District coordinators have visited nearly every school a minimum of two times since September at which time assistance was given and the philosophy of the program was discussed with members of the school staff. These visits and meetings were felt to be extremely beneficial to the project teachers. The project teachers also rated the support given to the program by their school's administration to be highly positive.

In terms of materials used in the Title I Reading Program, most areas were rated either "Good", "Very Good", or "Excellent" by the project teachers. (Table 16)

TABLE 16

PROJECT TEACHERS' RATING OF MATERIALS
GRADES (3-6) SPRING 1979 N=20

Category Observed	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
The availability of reading materials	-	-	2	3	15
Quality of reading materials	-	-	1	7	12
Accessibility of materials to children	-	-	-	5	15
Availability of low vocabulary high interest reading materials	1	-	3	8	8
Variety of materials	-	-	4	4	12
Suitability to varied reading levels	-	1	2	9	8
Availability of kits	-	-	3	3	14
Quality of kits	-	-	2	10	8

*See Table 13 for comparison of ratings of materials pre vs. post (Grades 3-6)

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL GRADES 7-9

Structured guides developed by the evaluators were employed in the conduct of classroom observations and interviews with project teachers and educational assistants. The first series of scheduled observations and interviews occurred in the Fall, 1978. The post-series was conducted during April and May 1979. All participating Title I junior high schools were visited.

At the junior high school level (7 through 9) the instructional program is departmentalized and therefore remedial reading instruction takes place during a designated class period. The project teacher (1 per class) and an educational assistant (at least one per class) conduct small group instruction and meet with students for approximately 45 minutes per session, five times each week. This remediation is supplemental to the regular classroom English and/or Language Arts Programs.

Classroom Observations Grades 7-9

Twenty-three remedial reading sessions were observed at the participating junior high schools during the Fall 1978. Eighteen sessions were observed during the Spring 1979. Aspects of the program concerning instruction, adult-student ratio, learning climate, student interest and participation, and materials were examined.

Reading instruction for students in grades 7-9 was conducted, in all cases, in a room specifically set aside for this remedial program. In a few cases, the room in use also housed laboratory stations but there always appeared to be sufficient room for the size of the group. At one school (Z), the reading

room was jointly used by students receiving PSEN instruction. However, the PSEN teacher instructed her students separately from Title I reading students who received their instruction from their own project teacher and/or the educational assistant.

A project teacher and an educational assistant assigned to each class provided instruction to students who appeared to be grouped by skill level. Each adult worked with a maximum of seven students in small groups. Individualization of instruction appeared the rule rather then the exception. A planned approach to instruction between the educational assistant and the teacher was in evidence. Pupil profile sheets are available and are utilized by most teachers and/or educational assistants throughout the District. In some isolated instances, the observer was unable to determine whether or not the profiles were utilized. At another site, "job sheets" were intended to take the place of profiles, but were not kept current by most teachers. Additionally, in those schools where check marks were used as evidence of mastery, etc. on individual profiles, there appears to be no entry of a date where such improvement or mastery of a skill was confirmed.

The skills being addressed included comprehension, drawing inferences, vocabulary development, dictionary usage, outlining, understanding the main idea, resume writing, vowel sounds, word attack skills, sequence of events, reading for enjoyment and listening skills.

For the most part, the observed learning climate was rated as organized and generally well planned. This finding was consistent throughout the year. The observer also rated the majority of the remedial sessions as being high in level of interest and participation.

TABLE 17

OBSERVED LEVELS OF STUDENT INTEREST AND PARTICIPATION
GRADES (7-9) SPRING 1979 N=18

Category Observed	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
apparent level of student interest	-	1	2	13	2
apparent level of student participation	-	1	-	11	6
behavior of 51% +(majority) of the students	-	-	2	7	9
adult-student rapport	-	-	1	9	8

Effective use of materials for individualization was observed and this included audio-visual equipment, skillbooks, trade books, workbooks, library books, kits and manipulative materials. In most cases, materials were rated by the observer as "good," "very good", or "excellent." In the Fall visits 48 percent of the classrooms observed then reflected an insufficient quantity of manipulative materials and games, in 35 percent of the observed classrooms,

the quantity of available workbooks was limited. Post observations indicated that this situation has been improved considerably.

TABLE 18

OBSERVER RATING OF MATERIALS
GRADES (7-9) SPRING 1979 N=18

Category Observed	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Availability of reading materials	-	-	1	10	7
Quality of reading materials	-	-	-	13	5
Accessibility of materials to children	-	-	2	6	10
Availability of low vocabulary high interest reading materials	-	-	7	10	1
Variety of materials	-	-	1	14	3
Suitability to varied reading levels	-	-	4	13	1
Availability of kits	1	-	4	5	8
Quality of kits	1	2	4	8	3
Availability of workbooks	-	-	5	8	5
Quality of workbooks	-	4	3	8	3

*See Table 19 for a comparison of Ratings of Materials Grades (7-9) pre vs. post.

Interviews with Educational Assistants-Grades 7-9

A total of thirteen educational assistants were interviewed during pre and post visitations to elicit their perceptions of the Title I reading program in grades 7-9. Data collected during the post survey period indicated that the educational assistants' experience ranged from 1 through 10 years with an average of 5.7 years.

Although the most experienced educational assistants receive training as needed, most others receive between 3 and 5 hours of training per week from the project teacher.

Most of the interviewed educational assistants reported their attendance at several workshops at the District Office during the 1978-79 school year and most indicated that workshops take place once each month. Topics covered at District Office workshops this year included: sex role stereotyping, testing, vocabulary building, developing new ideas, working on main ideas and teaching strategies.

All but three of the educational assistants interviewed are either current residents of District #10 or were former residents. Fifty percent indicate that they are bilingual and spoke either Spanish, Italian or Yiddish as their second language.

The interviewees expressed confidence in their own abilitites to handle instructional responsibilities, (Table 20) but felt that additional training in teaching comprehension skills, lesson planning and materials preparation

TABLE 19

A COMPARISON OF RATING OF MATERIALS (GRADES 7-9)
TEACHERS, EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANTS, OBSERVERS PRE/POST

Materials	Teachers N = 20/24					Educational Assistants N = 13/13					Observers N = 23/18				
	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excel-lent	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excel-lent	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excel-lent
Availability of Reading Materials	0/0	3/0	2/2	9/9	6/10	0/0	2/0	3/2	8/6	0/5	0/0	0/0	7/1	8/10	8/7
Quality of Readers	0/0	2/0	6/5	6/5	6/11	0/0	2/1	2/1	7/6	2/5	0/0	0/0	4/0	12/13	7/5
Availability of Low Vocabulary-High Interest Materials	2/0	3/2	4/5	5/7	6/7	1/0	2/0	2/3	7/6	0/4	ND/0	ND/0	ND/7	ND/10	ND/1
Availability of Kits (Variety of Materials)	1/1	2/0	5/3	3/10	9/7	0/0	2/0	1/2	6/3	3/8	1/1	3/0	4/4	6/5	9/8
Quality of Kits	1/1	1/0	5/5	6/7	7/8	0/0	2/1	3/2	4/1	3/9	ND/1	ND/2	ND/4	ND/8	ND/3
Availability of Workbooks	3/1	4/7	4/5	4/3	5/5	0/1	2/0	4/1	5/6	2/4	5/0	3/0	2/5	5/8	8/5
Quality of Workbooks	2/0	2/1	8/10	3/4	5/6	4/0	6/1	1/3	1/5	1/4	ND/0	ND/4	ND/3	ND/8	ND/3

would be helpful.

TABLE 20

EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANTS' PERCEPTION OF SELF-PREPAREDNESS IN WORKING WITH CHILDREN (7-9) APRIL 1979 N=13

Category Observed	Very Inade-quate	Inade-quate	Somewhat Adequate	Ade-quate	Very Ade-quate
giving small group instruction in reading				4	9
giving 1-to-1 remedial reading instruction				2	11
preparing materials				5	8
using varied materials for remedial reading instruction			1	7	5
administering discipline			2	9	2
assessing student progress			1	5	7

*See Table 6 for an aggregate (K-9) comparison pre vs. post of the Educational Assistants perceptions.

Educational Assistants, in all but isolated instances, felt positive about the teacher-educational assistant teamwork relationship. The atmosphere was indicated to be friendly, well planned, systematically organized, and cooperative.

Most of the educational assistants interviewed found the support materials for the program to be in adequate supply and of high quality. (Table 21)

TABLE 21

EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANTS' RATING OF MATERIALS
GRADES (7-9) SPRING, 1979 N=13

Category Observed	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
The availabilty of reading materials	-	-	2	6	5
Quality of reading materials	-	1	1	6	5
Accessibility of materials to children	-	-	2	5	6
Availability of low vocabulary high interest reading materials	-	-	3	6	4
Variety of materials	-	-	1	6	6
Suitability to varied reading levels	-	-	2	6	5
Availability of kits	-	-	2	3	8
Quality of kits	-	1	2	1	9
Availability of workbooks	-	-	1	6	4
Quality of workbooks	-	1	3	5	4

*See Table 19 for a comparison of ratings of materials, Grades (7-9) pre vs. post.

Sixty-nine percent of the educational assistants rated the level of parental involvement as "poor" or "fair".

Among the aspects identified by educational assistants as contributing to the success of the program were a competent and well organized staff, individualized attention, and good materials.

At the same time, large class size, lack of sufficient space and the district's high mobility rate were cited by the educational assistants as impediments.

Interviews with Project Teachers-Grades 7-9

Twenty Project teachers were interviewed in the Fall, 1978 and 21 were interviewed during post visitations. Project teachers for grades 7-9 teach remedial reading five periods each day in addition to their responsibilities of training the educational assistants.

All but two project teachers interviewed have attended between one and five workshops at the District Office since Septemeber, 1978. Topics covered at these workshops included: preparation for their city-wide reading test, orientation, writing skills, end of year summation of materials, competency test and general information.

The project teachers indicated that the project coordinator and/or her assistant had visited the schools between 3 and 10 times during the year and concerned themselves with materials, setting-up of reading labs, suggestion for upgrading the program, program goals and general support services.

The visits, as determined by the project teachers, were rated from "moderately helpful" to "extremely helpful." Project teachers felt that on-site regularly scheduled meetings with the project coordinator would enhance these efforts.

Aside from teaching five periods each day, the project teachers are involved in planning, reviewing student progress, administrative paperwork, and training of the educational assistants. Educational assistant training, occurs from as little as one hour per month (when assistants are highly experienced) to six hours per week and includes such things are planning for instruction, methodology and teaching techniques and reviewing student progress. Project teachers felt that, in some cases, additional training for educational assistants should include recognition of learning disabilities and remediation workshops.

In all but two instances the project teachers indicated that classrooms were adequate for the size of enrollment and in only one instance were storage areas truly inadequate. Some project teachers did request more book shelf and cabinet space as well as secured storage areas.

Thirty-three percent of the project teachers interviewed indicated that waiting lists existed (ranging from 7 to 10 per class to 90 students per school). Eighty-six percent indicated very positive support from school administration.

The teamwork between the project teachers and the educational assistants is reported by most interviewees as being "very friendly", "organized", and "mutually planned." All Project teachers expressed disappointment at the very low level of parent involvement.

Materials are considered by project teachers to be plentiful and appropriate to student needs. Workbook availability was the lowest rated of existing materials. (Table 22).

TABLE 22

PROJECT TEACHERS' RATINGS OF MATERIALS
GRADES (7-9) SPRING, 1979 N=21

Category Observed	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
The availabilty of reading materials	-	-	2	9	10
Quality of reading materials	-	-	5	5	11
Accessibility of materials to children	-	-	4	6	11
Availability of low vocabulary high interest reading materials	-	2	5	7	7
Variety of materials	-	-	3	8	10
Suitability to varied reading levels	-	1	1	9	10
Availability of kits	1	-	3	10	7
Quality of kits	1	-	5	7	8
Availability of workbooks	1	7	5	3	5
Quality of workbooks	-	1	10	4	6

*See Table 19 for a comparison of ratings of materials Grades (7-9) pre vs. post

Strengths of the program as perceived by the project teachers are small group and individual instruction, self-pacing of target students, good teamwork and organization, accessibility of materials, and administrative support.

Among the weaknesses of the program perceived by the project teachers are such things as "floating" educational assistants, long waiting time for placement of target students, large class size, and coverages by project teachers outside of the program.

To strengthen the program, project teachers would like to see the replacement of worn materials, common preparation periods for all reading personnel, elimination of out-of-program coverages and smaller class size.

Only 14 percent of the project teachers interviewed indicated that formal provision had been arranged for the project teacher to interact with other teachers who instruct for Title I target pupils.

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

TITLE I ESEA

NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL COMPONENT

B/E 5051-91623 and
91624

1978-79

The Non-Public Component was the only Title I program in Community School District #10 designed exclusively to meet the reading and mathematics needs of students attending non-public schools. Students functioning below grade level, and who would have been attending public schools and be eligible for Title I services based on home address, were selected to participate in the program.

The evaluation of this program assessed the improvement in reading and mathematics achievement scores for students in three participating non-public schools. At these schools, Title I teachers assigned by the New York City Board of Education were assisted in the conduct of remedial sessions by educational assistants assigned by Community School District #10. The three participating schools at which educational assistants were assigned during the 1978-79 school year were:

St. Martin of Tours	Our Lady of Mercy	Our Lady of Mt. Carmel
695 East 182nd Street	2512 Marion Avenue	2467 Bathgate Avenue

The primary objective of this program was to significantly improve the reading and mathematics achievement scores beyond expectation as measured by the Stanford Diagnostic Test administered on a pre and post basis. In reading, the objective was attained overall for all grades levels (2-5) in the program although in one particular school there were several instances of non-attainment. Most of the grade levels tested evidenced significant ($p. \leq .05$) improvement in reading scores beyond expectation. No overall conclusions were made for grades 6, 7, and 8 due to the very small number of student participants.

In mathematics the objective was attained for all grade levels (2-8) in the two participative schools. All of the grade levels tested evidenced significant ($p \leq .05$) improvement in mathematics scores beyond expectation.

It is recommended that educational assistants assigned to the non-public schools continue to attend district workshops for the improvement of participant skills.

OBJECTIVE

TO SIGNIFICANTLY IMPROVE READING COMPREHENSION SCORES BEYOND EXPECTATION OF PARTICIPANTS IN GRADES 2 THROUGH 9 AS MEASURED BY PRE AND POST ADMINISTRATION OF APPROPRIATE LEVELS OF THE METRO '78 SURVEY COMPONENT.

An appropriate level of the Stanford Diagnostic Test (Reading) was administered pre in the Fall of 1978 and post in May 1979. Students in the participating grade levles were tested pre/post. Reading comprehension scores were collected in raw score form and were converted to percentiles and then to Normal Curve Equivalent Units.

Mean pre and post-test scores are reported in Table NPR-1 by grade level for the three non-public treatment schools (assignment of assistants). Levels of significance obtained in testing for improvement with the paried data t-test are also reported in this table.

TABLE NPR-1

MEAN PRE/POST-TEST SCORES IN READING COMPREHENSION BY GRADE FOR TREATMENT SCHOOLS: (n=3) LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE OBTAINED IN TESTING FOR IMPROVEMENT

School	Grade	Number Tested	Mean Scores Pre	Post	t	Level of Significance
A	2	39	16.96	38.50	17.438	S
A	3	38	24.87	50.37	10.799	S
A	4	52	34.78	57.05	9.837	S
A	5	48	27.33	47.50	8.141	S
A	7	1	33.00	47.40	---	Insuff. data
B	2	6	23.21	48.80	2.341	NS
B	3	7	20.14	32.39	1.976	NS
B	4	5	33.34	44.48	5.952	S
B	5	5	25.56	35.70	2.102	NS
B	6	4	30.15	36.03	8.168	S
B	7	5	32.24	39.98	2.015	NS
B	8	2	31.50	35.10	---	Insuff. data
C	2	8	23.98	52.99	6.920	S
C	3	12	22.51	35.26	3.847	S
C	4	18	22.03	35.71	5.845	S
C	5	20	32.07	43.74	7.184	S
C	6	1	31.50	41.30	---	Insuff. data

*NS=Not Significant at ($P \leq .05$) or better.

Status of objective attainment - treatment schools

The objective was attained at grades 2, 3, 4 and 5. Overall, the objective was attained, as tested grade levels evidenced significant ($p \leq .05$) improvement beyond expectation in reading achievement. In School B, the objective was not achieved at grades 2, 3, 5 and 7.

OBJECTIVE: TO SIGNIFICANTLY IMPROVE MATHEMATICS SCORES BEYOND EXPECTATION OF PARTICIPANTS IN GRADES 2 THROUGH 8 AS MEASURED BY PRE AND POST ADMINISTRATION OF APPROPRIATE LEVELS OF THE METRO '78 SURVEY COMPONENT.

An appropriate level of the Stanford Diagnositc Test (Mathematics) was administered pre in the Fall of 1978 and post in May, 1979. Students in the participating levels at two schools were tested pre/post. Mathematics scores were collected in raw score form and were converted to percentiles and then to Normal Curve Equivalent Units.

Mean pre and post-test scores are reported in Table NPM-1 by grade level for the two non-public treatment schools (assignment of assistants). Levels of significance obtained in testing for improvement with the paired data t-test are also reported in this Table.

TABLE NPM-1

MEAN PRE/POST TEST SCORES IN MATHEMATICS
BY GRADE FOR TREATMENT SCHOOLS (N=3):
LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE OBTAINED IN TESTING FOR IMPROVEMENT

School	Grade	Number Tested	Mean Scores Pre	Post	t	Level of Significance
A	6	18	27.78	48.44	7.373	S
A	7	7	23.0	49.6	4.726	S
A	8	9	10.44	21.89	6.020	S
C	2	10	20.7	69.9	10.172	S
C	3	10	13.1	40.4	5.284	S
C	4	20	23.26	54.37	11.321	S
C	5	20	20.75	43.15	7.961	S

Status of objective attainment - treatment schools

The objective was attained at grades 2-8. Overall, the objective was attained at all grade levels in the two participating schools as students tested evidenced significant ($p \leq .05$) improvement beyond expectation in mathematics achievement.

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

TITLE I ESEA

OPTIONAL ASSIGNMENT READING

B/E 5051-91625
5051-98723
1978-1979

The Optional Assignment Reading program was offered at JHS 141 in Community School District 10 for students in grades 7 through 9. As of June 1, 1979, the program was serving 108 students (37 students at grade 7, 49 students at grade 8 and 22 students at grade 9). This represented a reduction from the 120 students who were reported to be in the program in December. It also represents a substantial decrease from the 152 students who were serviced by the same number of staff members in 1977-78. Since the start of the school year, 14 students were discharged from the program, most commonly because they had transferred to another school. Vacancies in student enrollment were filled from a waiting list developed early in the school year. At the time of the evaluator visitation in late May 1979, there were 14 students on the waiting list.

The program services students who, based on home address, would have been attending Title I designated schools and would have been eligible for remedial reading services. With the exception of the Optional Assignment Program in Reading, there are no other Title I services provided at JHS 141.

Selection of participating students for program services was based on student performance two years below grade level on the Spring 1978 New York City-wide reading test results. Teacher recommendations were also taken into consideration. All Title I staff and the Assistant Principal at JHS 141 were involved in the selection process. As a result of careful planning and early identification of students eligible for program services, the remedial instruction was able to commence by October 1, 1978.

One New York City licensed teacher and four educational assistants are assigned to the program. Four of the instructional staff members have five or more years experience in the OAP program, while one has less than one year's experience. All of the staff had attended workshops at the District Offices. The project teacher attended two workshops in the course of the academic year and the educational assistants also reported having attended several workshops. This has been supplemented by on-site staff development activities under the direction of the project coordinator. In addition to the supervisory role played by the district coordinator, on-site supervision and training has been provided at the school level under the direction of the Assistant Principal and the project teacher. Topic areas covered at the District Office workshops included: examination and utilization of new materials, program organization, and test preparation. Topic areas covered at the informal school sessions included: Articulation with subject teachers, reading in social studies, specific reading skills and presentation of new materials.

The program operated with two separate reading rooms and students had been scheduled to one room or the other based on their available time during the tightly scheduled school day. These classrooms have been designated exclusively for program use and are somewhat smaller in size than typical classroom areas. As perceived by the pupils, the roles of the teachers and the educational assistants are identical in nature. The major difference occurs only with respect to indirect supervision and training which takes on an informal aspect throughout the course of the year. Program staff assigned to one classroom feel that the space is inadequate for the size of enrollment and the nature of instructional activities. Storage space for program materials and instructional space appeared generally adequate for the needs of the program.

The program at this school has been functioning for several years and there is an excellent collection of instructional materials which accomodate a variety of modalities. There is more than an ample supply of readers, tapes, programmed items, etc. The staff members are fully knowledgeable about the materials and they make instructional prescriptions to meet student needs. Instructional sessions are handled in a very efficient manner with students receiving a maximum amount of attention during the period. Students are sufficiently self-disciplined to take their seats when they enter the room and to begin working without any directions. While the instruction takes place in quarters which are somewhat cramped (in one of the two rooms), there is a high degree of productivity evident.

Each remedial reading session is 35 minutes in length. Students received these remedial services supplemental to their regular programming in English and language arts. All students in the program were scheduled to receive one remedial reading session daily, with each student therefore eligible to receive a total of two hours and 55 minutes of remediation each week. The average adult-student ratio of one to four featured in these sessions allowed program staff to emphasize small group and individualized instruction.

Profile cards have been prepared for each student participant. For the most part, the entries reflect initial screening results (Spring 1978 NYC reading scores and pre/testing on standardized achievement tests). Periodic entries to reflect pupil progress are not evident. Some specific skill deficiencies are noted on the profile cards by the program staff, but there is no discernible pattern of updating the records.

Among the major improvements which have occurred in the course of the school year is the change of location for one of the reading rooms. During the Fall,1978 visitations, the evaluators reported that the assigned room was quite small. Shortly thereafter a larger room was located and used for this program.

The organization and conduct of this program can be traced to the qualities and competencies of the program staff. These individuals appear quite dedicated to helping their students progress in the area of reading skills improvement and their commitment to this task has fostered a positive atmosphere for learning. The staff's genuine concern for the student's well-being is clearly communicated to the students who seem to find comfort in such assurances and respond in kind by using their remediation periods very productively.

SUMMARY

The program has functioned smoothly and effectively. Students appeared generally interested in the remedial instruction and were active participants in the learning process. Staff members are competent and are respected for their work and the students are conscious of their own progress.

However, in spite of the smooth operation of the program, the pre/post achievement tests results on the Metro '78 Survey Test in Reading indicate that the program objective of significantly improving reading comprehension scores beyond expectation was not attained at all three grade levels (7, 8, and 9) in the program. The findings suggests that the district level coordinators must make every effort to analyze those factors which may be contributed to this situation. On the surface, the program appears to be very fluid and productive. However, for two consecutive years there has been a record of the program not attaining its full objectives. This requires some direct intervention.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 1978-79 INTERIM EVALUATION REPORT	IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 1978-79 INTERIM RECOMMENDATIONS
1. Efforts be made to provide student scheduling which maximizes student participation in this program.	1. Recommendation not implemented. No way to accomodate this at mid-year.
2. Additional (or larger) space be devoted to this program.	2. Recommendation implemented. One room relocated to a larger station.
3. Consideration to be given to a wider selection of audio-visual materials for student use.	3. Recommendation implemented. Spring observations recorded this to be in effect.

THE EVALUATORS COMMEND:

1. The ease with which the newer educational assistants have moved into their roles. This is a reflection upon their flexibility, their sense of dedication and the spirit of teamwork and support which is provided by the three "veteran" program staff.

2. The "efficiency factor" which is in evidence whereby the full amount of instructional time is devoted to the teaching/learning process.

3. The high quality of competent guidance, supervision and training which is being provided by the project teacher.

4. Early initiation of instructional sessions in the Fall, 1978.

5. The excellent condition of instructional materials which are available (and employed) in helping to remediate the skill deficiencies of individual pupils.

6. The efforts to open a dialogue with teachers of content area subjects to focus on reading improvement.

THE EVALUATORS RECOMMEND

1. That efforts be made to provide a schedule which maximizes student participation in this program. Apparently the nature of the school schedule has made it very difficult for some eligible students to receive the available remedial services.

2. That, in light of severely reduced student numbers in this program (152 to 108), a review of staffing assigned to the OAP program be conducted.

3. That, if Room 110 is continued to be used in this program, that some improvement be made in the ventilation system (the room has no windows.) Keeping the door open provides some flow of air but it also contributes to disruptive noise levels and distractions.

4. That student profile cards be updated on a regular basis. Student progress is informally monitored by the assigned educational assistants but there is no formal record-keeping as is expected by the district.

5. That, in light of the analysis which reveals no significant level of improvement at grades 7, 8, and 9, efforts be made to provide a more formalized process of monitoring pupil progress in relation to identified deficiencies. While a positive instructional atmosphere is evident, further assurance is required that the remediation activities are consistent with the verified pupil skill deficits.

Evaluation
Optional Assignment Reading
1978-79

OBJECTIVE: TO SIGNIFICANTLY IMPROVE READING COMPREHENSION SCORES BEYOND EXPECTATION OF PARTICIPANTS IN GRADES 7 THROUGH 9 IN JHS 141. AS MEASURED BY PRE AND POST ADMINISTRATION OF APPROPRIATE LEVELS OF THE METRO '78 SURVEY COMPONENT.

The Metro '78 Survey Test of Reading (Form JS) was administered to program participants in October, 1978. Post-testing was conducted in April, 1979 with the identical test. The Advanced 1 Test was used at all grade levels. Total reading scores were collected and converted to percentiles and Normal Curve Equivalents for analytical purposes.

The number of students completing the testing is summarized below in Table OAP-1. The absence of both test scores on some students is due to both absence or late entry into the program. In the opinion of the evaluators, the tested population adequately represents the program participants.

TABLE OAP-1

	Students Tested in Program			
Grade Level	Final Enrollment	Pre	Post	Pre/Post Match
7	37	25	33	17
8	49	47	52	33
9	22	18	28	17
Total	108	90	113	67

Table OAP-2 reports the pre-test mean, the post-test mean, the mean gain and the level of significance for each of the grade levels in the program. Mean scores are based on the use of Normal Curve Equivalent Units. The paired data t-test was employed to test for improvement.

TABLE OAP-2

PRE-POST TEST MEAN SCORES BY GRADE

Grade	Number Tested	Pre-Test Mean	Post-Test Mean	Mean Gain	Level of Significance
7	17	25.98	28.02	2.04	NS
8	33	26.96	29.11	2.15	NS
9	17	24.24	27.16	2.92	NS

Status of Objective Attainment

Grade 7- Objective not attained.

Grade 8- Objective not attained.

Grade 9- Objective not attained

While there was a discernible mean gain, the level of improvement did not prove to be statistically significant.

PROCESS EVALUATION

Observations

An evaluator conducted classroom observations and staff interviews during December,1978 and May,1979. Structured guides developed by the evaluators were utilized in the conduct of these on-site activities.

A total of eight remedial sessions were observed. In all of the sessions, students were being instructed in small groups with some one-to-one remediation occurring. Remedial skill areas being addressed in the observed sessions included: sequencing, vowels, vocabulary, use of the dictionary, reading comprehension (inference, main idea, and conclusions), writing skills and language expression. Students were grouped in each session based on specific skill needs. Based on the variety of materials observed in use, it was apparent that pre-planning had been undertaken so that students would be working with materials most suited for their immediate skill needs.

Materials were readily available and quite adequate in terms of both quantity and quality. The wide variety of materials available for program use is readily apparent when reviewing the following list of materials observed during the Spring, 1979 visitation.

MacMillian	Vocabulary Development
Reader's Digest	Reading for Skills
Globe	Journeys to Fame
SVE	"Underground Animals" (film/tape)
Scholastic	Sprint Reading Skills
Pendulum Press	Star Wars
Globe	Spell it Out
Continental	Spiral
McGraw-Hill	Reading Skill Cards
Reader's Digest	Science Reader
Steck-Vaughn	Reading,Thinking and Reasoning - Skills Program
Modern Curriculum Press	Write to Read

The evaluator rated the apparent learning climate in each session observed. Ratings were made on a continuum and the frequency of ratings are reported in Table OAP-3. Four sessions received the highest possible rating in all five areas assessed. The ratings in the #3 range of the continuum had been recorded for sessions observed during the December, 1978 observations.

TABLE OAP-3

EVALUATOR RATINGS OF LEARNING CLIMATE IN REMEDIAL SESSIONS

		Frequency of Rating on Continuum					
		1	2	3	4	5	
8	cold	-	-	-	4	4	warm
8	dull	-	-	2	2	4	stimulating
8	tense	-	-	1	3	4	relaxed
8	unruly	-	-	1	2	5	disciplined
8	disorganized	-	-	-	2	6	systematic

The evaluator rated the degree of student involvement in each session observed. Ratings were made on a scale from "Very Poor" to "Very Good" and are reported in Table OAP-4. The data collected clearly reports a high and positive level of student involvement.

TABLE OAP-4

EVALUATOR RATINGS OF STUDENT INVOLVEMENT IN REMEDIAL SESSIONS

Number Observed		Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good
8	Level of Student Participation			1	4	3
8	Level of Apparent Student Interest				5	3
8	Student Responsiveness				4	4
8	Apparent Level of Student Comprehension				3	5

The instructional staff had fully planned for the day's activities for the students, as reported by the observer. Materials were laid out for the students prior to their arrival in the remedial classroom so that the full period could be devoted to instruction. Students were observed working on various activities in the small groups or independently in their workbooks. Students were working on different skills with different materials.

In the opinion of the evaluators, the program appears to have developed a challenging learning climate. Students are well-disciplined and capable of utilizing the available remedial time to the utmost.

INTERVIEWS

Interviews were conducted with all five members of the instructional staff during December 1978 and again in May 1979. As of the start of the 1978-79 school year, four of the staff had a minimum of five years experience in the

Optional Assignment Program, while one had less than one year. Four of the five are residents in Community School District 10. On both the pre and post interviews, the four educational assistants all reported receiving on-going informal training at the school in addition to their attendance at workshops conducted at the District #10 Office. Several of the interviewees at the post visit identified diagnosis of learning disabilities and reading skill weakness as areas in which additional training would be welcomed.

Two of the five interviewees reported in May,1979 that storage space for program use was adequate; one felt space was fairly adequate and two felt space to be inadequate. The identical responses were also reported when questioned about the adequacy of instructional space. All staff members rated the quality and quantity of materials as being good or very good.

Attendance at the remedial sessions has been fair as reported by the staff. Average student absenteeism in the session was identified by all interviewees as twenty percent or less.

As compared to the Fall,1978 responses, the program staff continue to feel that the parents of participants, the principal of the school, and the district administrators hold very positive attitudes toward the program. Obstacles to the program were identified as student behavior, the lack of parent involvement and the absence of classroom teacher interest in the program.

When asked their opinion as to ways in which the program could be made more effective, several of the staff reported the need for greater articulation with subject area teachers in order to make them more aware of methods in dealing with and teaching these students. Also mentioned by two staff members was the need for a larger room to reduce an existing cramped condition.